

COLETTE CAILLAT \*

PROHIBITED SPEECH AND *SUBHĀSITA*  
IN THE THERAVĀDA TRADITION \*\*

*e keci... bhagavatā budhena bhāsīte  
save se subhāsīte vā*<sup>1</sup>.

Whatever the society or communities they wished to enlighten, all Indian legislators and teachers have laid great emphasis on the rules concerning speech and truthfulness. I propose to examine here some of the views expressed on this subject by the Theravādins in various Sutta and KhuddakaNikāya texts, and to investigate how they extend the concept of *musāvāda* or lie, and define *subhāsita*. From even a cursory

---

\* Member of ERA 94.

I thank Mr. K. R. Norman who was kind enough to amend the English text.

\*\* Abbreviations. For Pāli texts, as in *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, cf. *Epilogomena to Vol. I*, by HELMER SMITH, Copenhagen, 1948. For Jaina texts, as in WALTHER SCHUBRING, *Die Lehre der Jainas...*, Berlin und Leipzig, 1935 (Gundriss der Indo-Asianischen Philologie und Altertumskunde 3.7) = *The Doctrine of the Jainas...*, translated from the revised German edition by Wolfgang Beurlen, Delhi-Varanasi-Patna, 1962. T = *Tikā*.

1. ASOKA, Calcutta-Bairāt. Cf. the editions by E. Hultzsch, CII, I, Oxford, 1925, and K. L. Janert, in *Abstände und Schlussvokalverzeichnungen in Aśoka-Inschriften*, Wiesbaden, 1972 (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband 10).

Falsehood is always strongly condemned, e.g. Sn 664:

*mukha-dugga vibhūta-m-anariya  
bhūmahu pāpaka dukkata-kāri  
puris'anta kali avajāta  
mā bahu bhān' idha, nerayiko 'si,*

« O foul-mouthed, false, ignoble man,

Truth's murderer, ill-doer, vile:

Thou ill-born, least of men, woe's seed,

Speak here not much! Hell's man art thou! » (Hare's transl.). See also M I.415.16-19; It 18.8-18; etc.

On « truthfulness » in the « Jātaka Stories », see JOHN GARRETT JONES, *Tales and Teachings of the Buddha. The Jātaka Stories in Relation to the Pāli Canon*, London, 1979, *passim*, especially 138 ff.; cf. index, s.v.

comparison with the precepts handed down in other communities, it appears that, among the Buddhists, a shift of emphasis had very early taken place, and the new attitude they developed never lost ground: though always highly praised, exactitude and accuracy have nevertheless been supplemented by other much valued virtues.

Bearing in mind the fact that Brahmanic, Jaina and Buddhist circles share an important background, I shall here consider the Buddhists' opinions on three points.

First: like the other communities, the Buddhists consider *vāc* as belonging to the well-known triad *kāya*, *vāc*, *manas*<sup>2</sup>, in which *vāc* is clearly a prominent item<sup>3</sup>: A II.51.29 \* f. states that

*nābhāsamānam jānanti missam bālehi pāṇḍitam  
bhāsamānam ca jānanti desentam amatam padam,*

Perhaps it is not out of place here to recall Asoka's views on the subject. Several Minor Rock Edicts recommend telling the truth: II (B) *sace vataviye* (Erṛaguḍi; cf. Brahmagiri, Jatinga-Rāmeśvara, Rājula-Manḍagiri, Siddāpura); *sacca* is one of the components of *dhamma*, according to Pillar 2 (C) and 7 (EE); and, as is well-known, the Calcutta-Bairāṭ edict enjoins the *bhikkhus* and *bhikkhunīs* to listen to and meditate upon several texts, among which *e cā Lāghulovāde musāvādām adhigicya*, Lāghulovāda concerning lying. On the other hand, in the XII Rock Edict, *vaca-gu(t)i* is extolled and defined as « neither praising one's own sect nor blaming other sects », *a vaca-guti kiti ata-pāsaṇḍa-pūjā va pala-pāsaṇḍa-galahā vā no siyā* (Erṛaugḍi, D), cf. Hultzsch's transl. Compare *infra*.

In a recent paper (*The Calcutta-Bairāṭ Edict of Asoka*, in the « Volume in Honour of Professor J. W. de Jong... », edited by L. A. Hercus et al., Canberra, 1982, 491-498), U. Schneider has commented upon these recommendations emphasizing the fact that the Calcutta-Bairāṭ edict especially condemns lie and liars. It seems to me that, in fact, the above formula, *e keci... Bhagavatā bu(d)hena bhāsite sa(v)e se subhāsite vā*, « all that has been spoken by the Blessed (One, the) Buddha is well spoken indeed », cannot be separated from the Buddhists' definition of *su-bhāsita* (*infra*, 70 ff.). In this connexion, Professor E. Lamotte kindly reminds me of the reverse phrase, A IV, 164, 7 ff., *yam kim ci subhāsitam sabbam tam tassa bhagavato vacanam arahato sammāsaṇḍ buddhassa*, « whatsoever be well spoken, all that is the word of the Exalted One... » (Hare's translation): a formula which, as he informs me, has no counterpart in the *Ekottarāgama*, though it occurs in a *Mahāyānasūtra*, the *Madhyāśayasaṇḍodanasūtra*, the Sanskrit text of which is quoted in the *Sikṣāsamuccaya* (p. 15) and the *Panjikā* (p. 431 f.; cf. the discussions in E. LAMOTTE, *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse*, Louvain, 1949, in « Bibliothèque du Muséon », 18, I, pp. 80-4, and notes; II, p. 1070 f.).

2. For references in Pāli texts, see PED, s.v. *kāya* III. « (Ethical) ... *kāya* as one of a triad »; cf. the definition of *vinaya*, Pj I, 134, 15: *kāya-vācā-citta-vinayana*; etc.

As for the Jainas, they teach three *guptis* (W. SCHUBRING, *Die Lehre der Jainas*, Berlin-Leipzig, 1935 = *The Doctrine of the Jainas*, Delhi..., 1962, § 173).

But, according to L. Renou, this triad, well-known in Avestic, is absent in Vedic (*Canon bouddhique pāli*, II [in the press], see the note to I, Paris, 1949, p. 53.27 f. = D I 60.21 f.).

3. J. G. Jones emphasizes the « typically Buddhist attitude to right speech as being of paramount importance », *loc. cit.*, 60 f.; cf. 122 f., etc. He assumes that in Ja n° 56, guarding the voice is the first to be recommended. Actually, though Chalmers translates « do no evil whether in word, or thought, or act », the pa. text uses the usual phrase: *kāya-dvāram vaci-dvāram mano-dvāram ti tūṇi dvārāni raktha, mā kāyena pāpa-kammaṇi kari mā vācāya mā manasā*, I, 276, 27-29.

« If he utter no word men know him not —  
 A wise man mixed with fools.  
 If he open his mouth men know him  
 When he teaches the Deathless Way... »<sup>4</sup>.

As a matter of fact, the fool is characterized, in contradistinction to the wise man, by his bad behaviour as far as action, speech, mind, are concerned<sup>5</sup>. On the other hand, the Pabbajjā-sutta describes « the seer » (*cakkhumā*) thus:

*pabbajitvāna kāyena pāpa-kammam vivajjatī,  
 vacī-duccaritam hitvā ājīvam parisodhaya,*

« Gone forth, he wholly shunned  
 In body evil deeds,  
 And rid of wrongful talk,  
 He cleansed his way of life »<sup>6</sup>.

In the relevant commentary<sup>7</sup>, *vacī-duccarita* is said to be fourfold, a remark which agrees with many canonical passages<sup>8</sup> and with what is said in the Hemavata-sutta; here, yakkha Hemavata asks several questions about Gotama, among which we find:

« Say, doth he never speak false words?

.....  
 Doth he not use provoking speech?

Say, is his talk not slanderous?

Speaketh he never emptily? »,

to which yakkha Sātāgira's answer is the following:

*musā ca so na bhaṇati*

.....  
 atho na khīṇa-vyappatho

atho vebhūtiyam nāha, mantā attham so bhāsati<sup>9</sup>,

« Nay, he doth never speak false words,

.....  
 Nor speaketh he provokingly;

His talk is never slanderous;

With insight speaks he of the goal »<sup>10</sup>.

4. = S II 280,28\* f. = Ja V 509,27\* f.; *Gāndhārī Dharmapada* (ed. J. Brough) 235; *Udānavarga* (ed. F. Bernhard) 29,43.

Woodward's translation.

5. *Tīhi... dhammehi samannāgato bālo veditabbo... Kāya-duccaritena, vacī-duccaritena, mano-duccaritena*, A I, 102, 3 f.; *tīhi... dhammehi samannāgato paññito veditabbo... Kāya-sucaritena, vacī-sucaritena, mano-sucaritena*, ib., 7 f.; *bālo duccintitacintī ca hoti, dubbhāsita-bhāsī, dukkaṭakamma-kārī*, ib., 19 f.; *paññito sucintita-cintī ca hoti, subhāsita-bhāsī, sukaṭakamma-kārī*, ib., 30 f.

6. Sn 405-407, Hare's translation.

7. Pj II, 382, 14: *catubbidhāpā vacī-duccaritam*. Cf. *infra*.

8. *Cattār' imāni... vacī-duccaritāni... Musā-vādo, pisuṇā vācā, pharusā vācā, samphappalāpō*, A II, 141, 2-5. Also see D III, 170, 13-175, 27\*, *infra*.

9. Sn 158-159.

10. Hare's translation.

On *khīṇa-vyappatha*, K. R. NORMAN, in BSOAS, 42.2 (1979), 324 ff.

It can be seen that, as well as untruth and frivolous talk, harshness and slander are also vigorously condemned here: I shall revert to this fourfold condemnation in my third point.

But now, my second point. The Buddhists share the general Indian conviction that *vāc* is an active force<sup>11</sup>, and a sort of weapon; therefore, it can be dangerous, it can imply violence, and, if misused, it can hurt the man who handles it. Hence the rules which everyone, and more particularly consecrated individuals, should observe regarding speech. In a sloka concerning the *snātaka*, Manu summarizes them as follows:

*satyam brūyāt priyam brūyāt na brūyāt satyam apriyam  
priyam ca nānṛtam brūyād, esa dharmāḥ sanātanaḥ,*  
« Let him say what is true, let him say what is pleasing, let him  
utter no disagreeable truth,  
and let him utter no pleasant falsehood; that is the eternal law »<sup>12</sup>.

So saying, Manu follows — or rather encapsulates — various teachings of the *Dharmaśāstras*; for there also it is prescribed that one must abide by truth, and speak no harsh words, for they are liable to create enmity<sup>13</sup>.

The Dhp has the same warning:

*mā voca pharusam kamci, vuttā pativadeyyu tam;*  
*dukkhā hi sārambha-kathā, patidandā phuseyyu tam* (133),  
« Speak not harshly to anyone; those you address may answer you;

For angry words bring trouble; blows for blows may touch you »<sup>14</sup>.

Now, the terrible consequences brought about by cruel words and reprehensible speech are illustrated by the fate which Kokālika (alias Kokāliya) had to suffer after his deaths; they are alluded to in several

11. Cf. J. GONDA, *Die Religionen Indiens, I. Veda und älterer Hinduismus (Die Religionen der Menschheit)*. Herausgegeben von C. M. SCHRÖDER, 11), Stuttgart, 1960, p. 21 ff. (« Das Wort »); *tejo-mayī vāg iti*, ChUp 6.5.4; 7; *infra*, n. 20; further the « victory by speech(es) »; *subhāsita[m]-jaya*, S I 222.20-224.15 (*infra*, n. 59); etc. Compare, metaphorically, « the capacity of the language as a weapon », M. M. DESHPANDE, *Sociolinguistic attitudes in India. An historical reconstruction*, Ann Arbor, 1979 (Linguistica Extranea. Studia 5), 94.

12. Mn 4, 138; Bühler's translation (SBE 25).

13. Cf. *ĀpastambaDharmaSūtra*, ed. Bühler, Bombay, 1868, 1.11.31.17: *nāsau me sapatna* » *iti brūyāt*; *yady asau me sapatna* » *iti brūyād dvīṣantam bhrātrvyam janayet*, « (In company) he shall not say, "This person is my enemy". If he says, "This person is my enemy", he will raise for himself an enemy, who will show his hatred », Bühler's translation (SBE 2: 1.11.31.15!); cf. *Arthaśāstra*, 8.3.25 f.

14. BURLINGAME's translation, in *Buddhist Legends* (HOS 29, part 2). Fausböll notes a parallel saying, in *Mahābhārata* (SBE 10, p. 37 note); cf. « *Patna* » *Dharma-pada* (ed. G. Roth) 198; *Udānavarga* 26.3.

Generally speaking, compare, on *The origin of ahimsā* (and its « magico-ritualistic background »), H.-P. Schmidt, in *Mélanges d'indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou*, Paris, 1968 (Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne, 28), pp. 625-55.

Jātakas: he was punished because he spoke without considering circumstances and place, and without moderation and reflexion...<sup>15</sup>; and in addition, in his last rebirth, because of the calumnies and harsh words he uttered and the malevolent thoughts he nurtured against Sāriputta and Moggallāna<sup>16</sup>. The consequences are serious illness, death, and hell<sup>17</sup>.

It should be observed that (1) Kokkālika's words are condemned as being an act of cruelty, « *phārusam te kammaṇi katam* »; (2) it seems to be accepted that aggressive speech normally meets with retribution; for instance, Kokālika is told: « *may you be tormented according to your own word* », « *tava vācāya tvam eva paccassū* » *ti*<sup>18</sup>.

The same view is stated, although in other words, in Sn, where the opening stanza of the Kokāliya-sutta compares *dubbhāsita* with an axe...

« Wherewith the fool doth cut himself  
Whenas he speaketh evilly »,  
*purisassa hi jātassa kūthārī jāyate mukhe*  
*yāya chindati attānam bālo dubbhāsitaṁ bhaṇam*<sup>19</sup>,

that is *atta-cchedak'atthena kūthāri-sadisā pharusa-vācā*<sup>20</sup>. This saying, it should be noted, is repeated twice in S I, as well as in A V<sup>21</sup>; it also occurs at the beginning of the Lokapaññatti<sup>22</sup>.

(3) It is remarkable that the Buddhists pay great attention to the feelings underlying the words that are actually uttered: Kokālika's thoughts are not separated from his words; he is told: « *pasādehi Kokālika Sāriputta-Moggallānesu cittam* », « let your heart be in charity with Sāriputta and Moggallāna »<sup>23</sup>.

I now come to my third point: the general acceptance, in India, of the value of asceticism, discipline and self-control. In this connection,

15. Cf. Ja III.103.12\*-19\*; II.177.8\*-11\*; etc.

16. Cf. *Takkāriya-Jātaka* IV, 242 ff.; « *Kokālikena dve agga-sāvakā akkuṭṭhā* » *ti*, 244.30.

17. Compare *supra*, n. 1, Sn 664; or the dramatic narrative of the first lie, Ja III 454-461...

18. Ja IV 245.2; 7. - Conversely, kind words are rewarded, Ja IV 448 ff. (to which Mlle. Nalini Balbir draws my attention).

19. Sn 657; Hare's translation.

20. Pj II.477.15: it will be observed that *dubbhāsita* is equated with *pharusa-vācā*, which is « similar to an axe in the sense that it cuts (the user him)self. Cf. the *Mahābhāṣya* on *duṣṭā śabda*: *sa vāg-vajro yajamānaṇi hinasti* (*The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya* of *Patañjali*, ed. F. Kielhorn, Poona, 1962, third ed. by K. V. Abhyankar, 2.10.14); compare the heated axe in the ordeal ChUp 6.16.1 f.

21. S I.149.17\* ff., 152.22\* ff.; A V.171.12\*-13\*, 174.1\*-2\*.

22. Cf. EUGÈNE DENIS, *La Lokapaññatti et les idées cosmologiques du bouddhisme ancien*, Lille-Paris, 1977, I (text), p. 3; II (notes), pp. 5-6. It recurs in the *Mahāprajñā-pāramitāśāstra* (ETIENNE LAMOTTE, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, II, Louvain, 1949, repr. 1967, Bibliothèque du Muséon, 18, p. 812 [precisely, in the development concerning Kokālika, pp. 806-13]).

23. Ja IV.244.22; cf. Sv I.74.6 ff., *infra*.

the Buddhists, as is well-known, define ten *śikṣāpadas*<sup>24</sup>, the first four of which are closely related to the first four (*mahā*-)vratas of the Jainas and the first four vows of the Brahmanic ascetics<sup>25</sup>. The Buddhist list is often mentioned and the wording of the formula is quoted, e.g. in the *Dasasikkhāpada* of Khp:

1. *pāṇātipātā veramaṇī-sikkhāpadam samādiyāmi*,
2. *ādinnādānā veramaṇī-sikkhāpadam samādiyāmi*,
3. *abrahmacariyā veramaṇī-sikkhāpadam samādiyāmi*,
4. *musāvādā veramaṇī-sikkhāpadam samādiyāmi...*<sup>26</sup>.

The first *mahāvratas* of the Jaina monk are: (1) not to destroy life, (2) not to lie, (3) not to take what is not given, (4) to abstain from sexual intercourse<sup>27</sup>. Jacobi rightly observed that the corresponding « Buddhist vows... agree with those of the Jaina ascetics »<sup>28</sup> — except that the order of the enumeration is slightly different: with the Buddhists the pledge not to lie comes not as the second, but as the fourth vow<sup>29</sup>. Can the reason for this change be surmised? And is the difference between the Brahmanic and Jaina communities on the one hand, and the Buddhist community, on the other hand, not more important than would seem at first sight?

24. Vin I.83.31-84.2: *anujānāmi... sāmanerānam dasa sikkhāpadāni...: pāṇātipātā veramaṇī, adinnādānā veramaṇī, abrahmacariyā veramaṇī, musāvādā ve, amāṇī...*, referred to in E. LAMOTTE, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien...*, Louvain, 1958 (Bibl. du Muséon 43), p. 59, observing that all possible infringements are detailed in the *Prātimokṣa*. It is noteworthy that, in the *Vin*, « telling a conscious lie » is generally atoned for by a *pācittiya*, thus in *Vin* IV.2.14\*\*, etc.; cf. the discussion by I. B. HOPPER, *The Book of the Discipline*, I (SBB 10), p. XXV; II (SBB 11), p. 166, n. 1, also referring to Khp.

The atonements imposed on those who infringe the second *śikṣāpada* (i.e. taking what is not given) appear to be harder, cf. MARCEL HOFINGER, *Le vol dans la morale bouddhique*, in « Indianisme et Bouddhisme », Mélanges offerts à Mgr Etienne Lamotte, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1980 (Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 23), p. 177 ff.

25. H. JACOBI, *Jaina Sūtras* (SBE 22), p. XXII ff. - Cf., among the eight *angas* of the classical yoga, the first four *yamas*.

26. Khp 1.15.8.

27. On the Jaina monk's *maha-vyoyas*, SCHUBRING, *loc. cit.*, § 171; the *Dasaveyādīya-sutta* quotes them thus: *pañha:ne bhante mahavvaē pāṇāvīyādo veramaṇām...; ahāvare docce bhante mahavvaē musāvāyādo veramaṇām...; ahāvare tacce... mahavvaē adinnādānāo veramaṇām...; ahāvare cautthe... mahavvaē mehuṇāo veramaṇām...* (chapter 4, cf. ed. E. Leumann, ZDMG 46 [1892], p. 615.20 ff.).

28. *Loc. cit.*

29. Could this fourth position point to the fourfold content of *musāvāda-veramaṇī*? In any case, there seems to be some traditional association between the number « four » and items concerning speech, cf. the four Jaina *bhāsā-jāyā*, not to speak of the well-known *catvārī pada-jātāni, nāmākhyātōpasarga-nipātāś ca*, name, verb, prefix, particule, of the *Mahābhāṣya Pāpaśā* (ed. Kielhorn, p. 3.26) and the Sanskrit grammarians, and ultimately, of RV 1.164.45. See, on the semantic development of the word *pada*, and related problems, L. RENOU, *Les connexions entre le rituel et la grammaire en sanskrit*, in JA 233 (1941-42), pp. 134-37; 161 ff. Recent observations by Ch. Malamoud, in « Arch. europ. sociol. », 23 (1982), 219-220.

From Manu's *śloka satyam brūyāt priyam brūyāt...*<sup>30</sup>, it appears that there is a tendency to distinguish between different aspects of speech, of which, by means of permutations, Manu defines four varieties. In the canonical scriptures of the Svetāmbara Jainas also, *bhāsā* is analyzed into four main varieties (the so-called *bhāsā-jāyā*)<sup>31</sup>. They are: (1) truth, (2) untruth, (3) truth mixed with untruth, (4) what is neither truth nor untruth, nor truth mixed with untruth: *bhikkhū jānejjā cattāri bhāsā-jāyāim, tam-jahā: saccam̄ egam̄ padhamam̄ bhāsā-jāyam̄, bīyam̄ mosam̄, taiyam̄ saccā-mosam̄, jam̄ n'eva saccam̄ n'eva mosam̄ n'eva saccā-mosam̄ asaccā-mosam̄ tam̄ cauttam̄ bhāsā-jāyam̄*<sup>32</sup>. In the first variety, there are two subvarieties: truth which should *not* be uttered because it hurts; truth which *can* be spoken, as it is «not to be blamed and is not rough»,

... *saccam̄ ca an-avajjam̄ a-kakkasam̄*<sup>33</sup>  
... *giram̄ bhāsejja...*

Thus, the Jainas insist on the absolute necessity of refraining from directly or indirectly aggressive speech<sup>34</sup>; but, though they do examine this problem in detail, the main emphasis, in this second *mahāvrata*, is often on truth and accuracy.

With the Buddhists, the outlook seems somewhat different. For, when pure religious life is described — for instance, when the life led by «Samāna Gotama» is detailed, and this in his own words — the report begins with the first three *śikṣāpadas* (abstaining from destroying life, from stealing, from impurity), but, when it comes to the fourth *śikṣāpada*, the texts mention not one, but four items, viz., together with abstaining from falsehood, also abstaining from slander, from cruel talk, from frivolous talk: *pāṇātipātaṁ pahāya pāṇātipātā pativirato Samāno Gotamo... viharatīti...; adinnādānaṁ pahāya adinnādānā pativirato S. G.*

30. Cf. *supra*. A parallel recommendation occurs in *Mahābhārata* (BhORI ed.) 12.288.38 (quoted in CAILLAT, *Rules concerning bhāsā in the Āyāranga- and Dasaveyā- liya-suttas in the light of their Brahmanic counterparts*, in «Volume in honour of Dalsukh Malvania», in the press (*ubi alia*).

31. Cf. *Āyāranga-sutta* book 2, lesson 4; *Viyāhapannatti* chapter 13, ed. *Suttā-game*, Gurgaon, 1953, vol. 1.692.4 ff.; *Pannavaṇā*, ed. Punyavijaya, etc. (*Jaina-Āgama-Series* 9.1), p. 215, §§ 870-876; *Ṭhānanga* chapter 4.1; ed. *Suttāgame*, 223.8 (*cattāri bhāsā-jāyā*).

32. *Āyāranga-sutta*, ed. Jacobi, 2.4.1.4 (p. 91).

33. *Dasaveyāliya-sutta* chapter 7, st. 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Cf. *Āyāranga-sutta* 2.4.1.6: *se bhikkhū vā 2 jā ya bhāsā saccā, jā ya bhāsā mosā..., tahāppagāram̄ bhāsām̄ sāvajjam̄ sa-kiriyam̄ kakkasam̄ sakaduyam̄ niṭṭhuram̄ pharusam̄ aṅhaya-karim̄ cheyanā-karim̄ bheyanā-karim̄ pariyāvana-karim̄ uddavaṇa-karim̄ bhuṭṭvaghaṭiyam̄ abhikankha no bhāsām̄ bhāsejja*, «a monk or a nun, having well considered..., should not use speech which is blamable, sinful, rough, stinging, coarse, hard, leading to sins, discord, factions, grief, outrage, to destruction of living beings» (translation mostly following Jacobi, SBE 22, p. 151). The *Tikā*'s gloss for *pharusam̄* is *marmōdghāṭana-parām* (cf. ed. ĀgS, p. 387).

34. Cf. note 30.

*viharatīti...; abrahmacariyam pahāya brahmacārī S. G. ...; further: musā-vādām pahāya musā-vādā paṭivirato S. G. ...; pisuṇā-vācām* (v.l. *pisunam v.*) *pahāya pisuṇāya vācāya paṭivirato S.G. ...; pharusā-vācam* (v.l. *pharusaṁ v.*) *pahāya pharusāya vācāya paṭivirato S. G. ...; samphappalāpam pahāya samphappalāpā paṭivirato S. G. ...*<sup>35</sup>. More or less the same pattern is also followed elsewhere, for instance in the *Sallekha-sutta*<sup>36</sup>. Moreover, it will be remembered that several of the Tathāgata's *Mahāpurisa-lakkhanas* are due to his having abstained from the above four *vaci-duccaritas*<sup>37</sup>. On the other hand, these four abstentions, from false, slanderous, brutal, and frivolous words, *musā-vādā veramanī*, *pisuṇāya vācāya veramanī*, *pharusāya vācāya veramanī*, *samphappalāpā veramanī*, constitute a set group, listed among the « Fours in the Dhamma », which are enumerated in the *Sangīti-sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya*<sup>38</sup>, and there called *ariya-vohāra*, « the noble usage », or « noble mode » of speech, whereas not abstaining from the above mentioned faults is said to be *an-ariya-vohāra*<sup>39</sup>.

What is more, it is quite clear, from several passages, that each of these « fours » is counted as an independent item: when analyzing « failure in morals », *sīla-vipatti*, or « success in morals », *sīla-sampatti*, which lead to bad destiny and *niraya*, or to good destiny and *sagga-loka* respectively, the *Anguttara Nikāya* enumerates seven different sorts of individuals, each in his own right: *ekacco pāṇātipātī hoti, adinnādāyi*

35. D I.4.13-29.

From the attached reflections in D, it is clear that *pisuṇā vācā* leads to the disunion of friends and discord; that *pharusā vācā* wounds, while *a-pharusā vācā* is *neṭā kaṇṇa-sukhā pemanīyā hadaya-gamā, porī bahujana-kantā bahujana-manāpā*, « harmless, pleasant to the ear, agreeable, touching the heart, courteous, delightful to many folk, pleasant to many folk » (Woodward's transl., of A I.128.23-25); as for *samphappalāpā*, it is futile (see D *ib.*). According to Sv. I.74.1.4, *pisuṇā vācā* fills the heart of the person with whom one is conversing with amicable dispositions towards oneself, but estranges him from other people, *yāya vācāya yassa tam vācam bhāsatī, tassa hadaye attano piya-bhāvam parassa ca suñña-bhāvam karoti, sā pisuṇā vācā;* whereas *pharusā vācā* makes both oneself and others hurtful, is hurtful in itself, *yāya pana attānam pi paraṇi pi pharusaṇi karoti, yā vācā sayam pi pharusā, n' eva kaṇṇa-sukhā na hadaya-sukhā vācā, ayaṁ pharusā vācā.*

Compare Āyār T, note 33. *supra*.

36. M I.42.9-15.

37. D III.170.13-175.27\*: ... *musā-vādā paṭivirato ahosi... ekeka-lomo ca hoti aṇṇā ca bhamuk'antare jātā hoti... pisuṇāya vācāya paṭivirato ahosi... cattārisa-danto hoti avivara-danto ca...; pharusāya vācāya paṭivirato ahosi... pahūta-jivho ca hoti Brahma-ssaro ca karavika-bhāṇī...; samphappalāpā paṭivirato ahosi... sīha-hanu hoti.*

38. D III.232.7-8; 5-6; 7-8:

*Cattāro an-ariya-vohārā: musā-vādo, pisuṇā vācā pharusā vācā, samphappalāpo. Cattāro ariya-vohārā: musā-vādā veramanī, pisuṇāya vācāya veramanī, pharusāya vācāya veramanī, samphappalāpā veramanī.*

39. For a different definition of (*an-)ariya-vohāra*, *ib.*, 10-21; A II.246.4 ff. = Vin V.125.9 ff. (*adiṭṭha adiṭṭha-vāditā...*).

On the compound *ariya-vohāra* used to refer to « the vernacular speech of the Aryans », *viz.* pa., CPD I s.v.; on the implication of the word, (« langue noble »), L. RENOU, *Histoire de la langue sanskrite*, Lyon, 1956 (*Les langues du monde*), p. 6 and n. 1.

hoti, kāmesu micchā-cārī hoti, further mūsā-vādī hoti, pisuṇā-vāco hoti, pharusā-vāco hoti, samphappalāpī hoti...: sīla-vipatti-hetu vā... sattā kāyassa bhedā param marañā apāyam duggatim vinipātam nirayam uppajjanti<sup>40</sup>. Thus, the four constituents of *ariya-vohāra* are all equally important, and each tends to be regarded as equivalent to each of the previous *sikkhā-padas*.

It could even be asked whether the Buddhists do not, in fact, more or less establish the superiority of *a-pharusā-vācā*; for the Anguttara-Nikāya introduces a threefold distinction: between the *gūtha-bhāñī*, « who speaks filth », that is untruth<sup>41</sup>, on one side, and, on the other side, the *puppha-bhāñī*, « flower-tongued », who speaks the truth, and *madhu-bhāñī*, or « honey-tongued », who has abandoned all harsh speech<sup>42</sup>. It thus appears that amiable speech is given special importance — provided that it is prompted by equally amiable feelings<sup>43</sup>.

To return to the fourfold *ariya-vohāra*: the commentaries do not hesitate to recognize its four constituents whenever four aspects of speech are mentioned, e.g., when the Buddha's behaviour is extolled by

40. A I.268.23 ff. « And of what sort is failure in morals? Herein... a certain one takes life, steals, is a wrong-doer in sensual desires, a liar, a slanderer, of bitter speech, an idle babbler. This is called « failure in morals »... it is due to failure in morals... that beings, when body breaks up, after death are reborn in the Waste, the Way of Woe, in the Downfall, in Purgatory », Woodward's transl.; compare III.433.3-11.

41. Or *kūta-bhāñī*? (Kern); hence Woodward's translation « tricky tongued »; cf. his note, *Gradual Sayings* I, p. 110, n. 3.

42. A I.127.33-128.28.

Tayo 'me... puggala santo samvijjamāna lokasmiñ. Katame tayo? Gūtha-bhāñī puppha-bhāñī, madhu-bhāñī...

Katamo ca puggalo puppha-bhāñī? Idha... ekacco puggalo sabha-ggato vā parisa-  
ggato vā... So... na sampajāna-musā-bhāsiṭī hoti... (128.12-20; cf. Pp 29.26-34);

Katamo ca... puggalo madhu-bhāñī? Idha... ekacco puggalo pharusā-vācam pa-  
hāya pharusāya vācāya paṭivirato hoti.

Yā sā vācā neñā kañña-sukhā pemanīyā hadayam-gamā porī bahujana-kantā bahujana-maññāpā tathā-rūpiñ vācam bhasitā hoti (A ib., 21-26; cf. Pp 29.35-30.3).

[« Sweet(ness) » or « honey » (*mādhu-*), and « words », *vācas-*, are seen to be more than once associated in the *Rksañhiṭā*:

ávācāma... Agnāye mādhumad vācaḥ..., 1.78.5;

tūbhyyedām Agne mādhumattamañ vācaḥ, 5.11.5;

vācāḥ / gṛhtāt svādiyo mādhuṇaś ca vocata, « sweeter than ghee and honey », 8.24.20; etc.; cf. K. F. GELDNER, *Der Rigveda*, ... Vierter Teil. Namen- und Sachregister... von Johannes Nobel, Cambridge, Mass., 1957 (HOS 36), p. 197, s.v. *Rede*. Compare *TaittiriyaSañhiṭā*, 3.3.2 (éd. B I, III, p. 273): *mādhu maniṣye, mādhu janisye mādhu vaksyāmi, mādhu vadisyāmi*, « sweetness shall I think, sweetness shall I beget, sweetness shall I tell, sweetness shall I speak... » (*madhuvat priyam*, Commentary). This association is admittedly Prearyan, cf. MARCELLO DURANTE, *Ricerche sulla preistoria della lingua poetica greca*, in « Rendiconti, Atti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei », 357 (1960) = *Indogermanische Dichtersprache*, herausgegeben von Rüdiger Schmitt, Darmstadt, 1968 (Wege der Forschung 165), p. 264, n. 10, comparing μελ-γηρυν δπα, μ 187; also Greek μελ-γλωσσος and Vedic *mādhu-jihva*-].

43. Cf. Sv I.74.6 ff. (yā tesam [scil. mūsāvāda, etc.] mūla-bhūtā cetāna pi pisuṇā-  
vācādi-nāmāpi eva labhati...).

yakkha Sātāgira<sup>44</sup>. Again, they are said to define *su-bhāsita*, in Buddhaghosa's commentary on the Subhāsita-sutta of the SamyuttaNikāya<sup>45</sup> and the parallel explanation given by the Paramatthajotikā on the identical sutta of the SuttaNipāta<sup>46</sup>. The prose introduction of the sutta specifies that speech is well spoken if provided with four elements: *catūhi... angehi samannāgatā vācā subhāsita hoti na dubbhāsita*: which four? *Idha... bhikkhu subhāsitaṁ yeva bhāsati no dubbhāsitaṁ; dhammaṁ yeva bhāsati, no adhammam; piyāṁ yeva bhāsati, no appiyāṁ; saccaṁ yeva bhāsati, no alikam*<sup>47</sup>. In the same way, the following triśṭubh of the sutta mentions successively *subhāsita*, *dhamma*, *piya*, and *sacca*, which, according to the commentaries, mean abstaining from *pisūñā vācā*, *samphappalāpa*, *apharusa vācā*, and *musā-vāda*<sup>48</sup>. I shall not question the details of the equation; but attention must be drawn to the commentaries' opinion concerning the conclusion of the prose passage of the sutta, viz., *imehi kho bhikkhave catūhi angehi samannāgatā vācā subhāsita hoti na dubbhāsita anavajjā ca ananuvajjā ca viññūnām ti*<sup>49</sup>, « when a word has these four qualities (anga), it is well-spoken, not ill-spoken, it is not blameworthy, nor blamed by the wise »<sup>50</sup>.

From Buddhaghosa's discussion of this passage, it can be surmised that some understood the phrase *imehi... catūhi angehi* as referring to

44. Cf. *supra*, Sn 158 f.; Pj II, 203 f.: *na khīna-vyappatho ti na pharusa-vāco ti vuttam hoti...*

45. S I.188.25-189.25\*; Spk I.272.8-275.24.

46. Sn p. 78 f., 450-454; Pj II, 394.9-400.5.

Four stanzas (= Sn 451-454) recur in Th (1227-1230); Sn 450 and 454 are also quoted in Pj I, 135 f., commenting upon the pāda *subhāsita ca yā vācā* (= pāda c in the 4th sloka of Mangala-sutta, Khp 3.7\*-8\*).

The wording of the two commentaries is very similar. For discussions on the authorship of Pj I and II, E. W. ADIKARAM, *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, Colombo, 1946, p. 7 f.; NĀNAMOLI, *The Minor Readings and Illustrator*, London, 1960 (PTS Transl. Series 32), X ff.; remarks by K. R. NORMAN, in *The Role of Pāli in early Sinhalese Buddhism*, in « *Buddhism in Ceylon...* » (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung I), ed. H. Bechert, Göttingen, Abh. der Ak. der Wiss. Philol.-Hist. Kl. Dritte Folge n° 108), p. 42; id., in *Buddhist Studies in honour of Walpola Rahula*, 1890, p. 177, § 6.1.

47. S I.188.31-189.2 = Sn p. 78.8-13.

48. « *Subhāsitaṁ uttamam āhu santo  
dhammam bhane, nādhammam, tam dutiyam  
piyāṁ bhane nāppiyām, tam tatiyam,  
saccam bhane nālikam, tam catuttham* » ti, S I.189.7\*-10\* = Sn 450:  
« The goodly word calm men proclaim supreme;

And second, speak ye Dharma not elsewhere;

Third, speak kindly, not unkindly words;

And fourth, say ye what is true, not false » (translation following Hare and C. Rhys Davids). Spk I.272.8-10 = Pj II.395.20-23 run: *angehi ti, kāraṇehi avayavehi vā, musā-vāda-veramaṇi-ādīni hi cattāri subhāsita-vācāya kāraṇāni, sacca-vacanādayo cattāro avayavā*.

49. S I.189.2-4 = Sn 78.14-16.

50. Hare's translation.

grammatical elements, and to grammatical niceties<sup>51</sup>. In the present context, however, this interpretation is evidently untenable. But it was not irrelevant to raise the question. For, as is well-known, the Brahmanic tradition did consider grammar to be *vedānām veda*, as the Chāndogya-Upaniṣad puts it<sup>52</sup>; and, according to the Sanskrit grammarians, correct speech is of religious value<sup>53</sup>. As for the Jainas, it is noteworthy that, in the Āyāranga-chapter which deals with the four « *bhāsā-jāyā* », they quote a list of grammatical items, and recommend abiding by grammatical rules — for this means speaking with accuracy and due circumspection, thus conforming to ascetics' standards<sup>54</sup>. Thus, the Jainas both

51. *Yan ca aññe paññādīhi avayavehi, nāmādīhi padehi, linga-vacana-vibhatti-kāla-kāraka-saṃpattihi ca samannāgatam musā-vādādī-vācaṇ pi « subhāsītā » ti maññānti, tarī dhammatō paññesedheti*, Spk I.273.14-18 = Pj II.397.2-4.

52. ChUp 7.1.2; but, ib. 3, grammatical and similar knowledge is said to be « mere name », *nāmaivaitat*.

53. Cf. *Mahābhāṣya*, ed. Kielhorn, p. 2, 19\*-20\* ff.:

*yas tu prayunkte kuśalo višeṣe śabdān yathāvad vyavahāra-kāle  
so 'nantam āpnoti jayaṇi paratra vāg-yoga-vid, duṣyati cāpaśabdaiḥ,*

the learned grammarian who uses the words correctly... gets unlimited success in the other world; but one fares ill by the use of incorrect words... Cf. L. Renou, in JA (1941-42), 160 ff.; ib., *Histoire de la langue sanskrite*, Lyon, 1956, p. 6: « L'idée de la grammaire comme instrument de purification est présente dans le plus ancien commentaire grammatical, la Paspaśā du Mahābhāṣya, comme à travers toute la Mīmāṃsā. Also see P. THIEME, *Meaning and form of the « grammar » of Pāṇini*, Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik 8/9 (1982-83), 3-34 (especially §§ 22; 26; 30 ff.); M. M. DESHPANDE, loc. cit., 7 ff. (ch. II, « Brahmanical Puritanism »).

54. *apuṇī niṭṭhā-bhāṣī samiyāe saṃjae bhāṣam bhāṣejjā, tam-jahā: ega-vayaṇam 1, du-vayaṇam (!) 2, bahu-v. 3, itthi-v. 4, purisa-v. 5, napuṇsaga-v. 6, aijhaththa-v. 7, uvāṇiya-v. 8, avaṇiya-v. 9, uvaṇiya-avaṇiya-v. 10, avaṇiya-uvaṇiya-v. 11, tiyya-v. 12, paḍuppanna-v. 13, aṇāgaya-v. 14, paccakkha-v. 15, parokkha-v. 16... Āyār 2.4.1.3: « well considering (what one is to say), speaking with precision, one should employ language in moderation and restraint: the singular, dual, plural; feminine, masculine, neuter gender...; past, present, or future (tenses), the first and second, or third (person) », Jacobi's translation.*

The importance of self-control (i.e. religious life) is emphasized in *Pannavaṇā*: in § 899, it is asked whether one who uses the four *bhāsā-jjāyās* reaches the goal or fails to do so, *icc'eyāiṇ... cattāri bhāsā-jjāyāiṇ bhāṣamāṇe kim ārāhae virāhae?* Answer: only he who speaks with due attention can reach the goal; otherwise, « if one is not self-controlled, has not totally ceased, desisted from, renounced, bad deeds, whether one speaks truth or lie, or truth mixed with lie, or neither truth nor lie, one does not reach the goal, but misses it »: *icc'eyāiṇ cattāri bhāsā-jjāyāiṇ bhāṣamāṇe ārāhae. no virāhae; teṇa param assamjayaṇvirayāpādihayāpaccakkhāyāṇ pāvakamme saccam vā bhāṣam bhāṣamāṇa vā saccā-mosam vā asaccā-mosam vā bhāṣam bhāṣamāṇa no ārāhae, virāhae.*

But, in the *Samayasāra* (one of the early « procanonical » books of the Digambaras) 1.8, Kundakunda (quoted by M. M. DESHPANDE, loc. cit., 55) writes:

*jaha na vi sakkam aṇajjo aṇajja-bhāṣam viṇā u gāhedenū  
taha vavahārena viṇā param'atth'uvaḍesāṇam asakkam,*

« just as a non-Aryan (foreigner) cannot be made to understand anything except through the medium of his non-Aryan language, so the knowledge of the Absolute cannot be communicated to the ordinary people except through the *vyavahāra* point of view » (transl. A. Chakravarti, also see his commentary, based upon Amṛtacandra's *Ātmakhyāti*, Delhi, 1971, 2d ed., Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha Publication).

enhance spiritual values and consider grammatical correction to be an integral part of their religious rules.

The Buddhists certainly do not disregard grammar and lexicography: in a paracanonical treatise like the *Nettipakarana*, the « phrasing or wording of ideas » (*vyanjana*), is connected with *nerutta*, etc.<sup>55</sup>, which is included in one of the sixteen *hāras* or « modes of conveying » used for the communication of *dhamma*<sup>56</sup>. But they have no hesitation in stating that the phrase *subhāsitā ca yā vācā* (used in *Khp* 3, 8\*) « should be understood as [speech] devoid of the defects of lying, [harsh speech, malicious speech, and gossip]... or else speech simply without gossip... since it brings welfare and pleasure in both worlds »<sup>57</sup>.

Still more drastically, commenting on this fourth stanza of the *Mangala-sutta*, *Pj* adds: *paresam dhamma-desanā vācā idha subhāsitā vācāti veditabbā; sā hi... sattānam ubhaya-loka-hita-sukha-nibbānādhigama-paccayato mangalam ti vuccati*, « what is to be understood here as "well-spokenness" is the words [used] in teaching the True Idea to others; for that... is called a good omen since it is a condition for creatures to attain welfare and pleasure in both worlds and also extinction as well »<sup>58</sup>. *Buddhaghosa* even appears to consider grammatical purity as irrelevant as far as *Dhamma* is concerned: provided that a discourse is free from the four blemishes, slander, idle talk, harshness, untruth, — and even though it contains *milakkha-bhāsā*, barbarian's words, and words sung by a humble servant — it is nevertheless *su-bhāsita* « as far as it conveys bliss for this and the other world »<sup>59</sup>. Examples

55. Nett 32.30 ff.

56. Cf. the analysis of *nerutta*, Nett 33.1-11. It implies, among other proficiencies, for the bhikkhu to be « ... skilled in designations of past [tenses], skilled in designations of future [tenses], skilled in designations of presently-arisen [tenses], skilled in designations of the feminine [gender], skilled in designations of the masculine [gender], skilled in designations of the neuter [gender], skilled in designations of the singular [number], skilled in the designations of the plural [number]... » (Nāṇamoli's transl.): ... *atitādhivacana-kusalo anāgatādhivacana-kusalo paccupannādhivacana-kusalo ithādhivacana-kusalo purisādhivacana-kusalo napūrṇasākādhivacana-kusalo ekādhivacana-kusalo anekādhivacana-kusalo* (6-9); compare *Pet* 91.24 ff.; for a comparison, and study of the mutual relationship between Nett and Pet, NĀNAMOLI, *The Guide*, London, 1962 (PTS Translation Series 33), p. XIII ff. and passim.

57. *Pj* I.135.23-136.1, translation by Nāṇamoli: *subhāsitā vācā nāma musāvādādī-dosa-virahitā... asampappalāpā vācā eva vā...; ayam pi ubhaya-loka-hita-sukhāvahato mangalam ti veditabbā...*

58. *Pj* I.136.4-7 (Nāṇamoli's translation).

59. *Imehi pana catūh' angehi samannāgatā, sace pi milakkha-bhāsa-pariyāpannā ghaṭa-ceṭikā-gītaka-pariyāpannā pi hoti, (sā) tathā pi subhāsitā va lokiyā-lokuttara-hita-sukhāvahattā, Spk I.273.20-23 (Ee: -cetaka) = Pj II.397.7-10.*

On the contrary, *Mahābhāṣya*, *Paspāsā*, p. 2.7-9, recalls the misfortune of the Asuras because of their barbarism (cf. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 3.2.1.23-24) and concludes: *mlecchāḥ mā bhūmety adhyeyāpi vyākaraṇam*, « to prevent our becoming "mlecchas", grammar is to be studied ».

Did *Buddhaghosa* have this famous passage in mind? On *Buddhaghosa* and *Pāṇini* and the Sanskrit grammatical tradition, NĀNAMOLI, *Minor Readings and Illu-*

are further alleged of bhikkhus attaining *arahatta* after having heard Sinhalese girl servants singing inspiring words, in the Sinhalese language. In this connexion, the *viññus*, or experts, are *not* the grammarians, but those noble people who aim at and look for refuge in the highest goal, *atth'atthikānam kula-puttānam attha-paṭisaraṇānam, no vyanjana-paṭi-saraṇānam ti*<sup>60</sup>.

This catholic outlook is all the more remarkable as it is expressed by the revered Buddhist ācārya, alleged to have stemmed from a Brahmin family, Buddhaghosa<sup>61</sup>.

---

*strator*, p. XVIII, notes *passim* (for references see Index of Proper Names s.v. Pā-nini, Sanskrit allusions); K. R. NORMAN, *The Role of Pāli in early Sinhalese Buddhism*, p. 42 and nn. 22-23.

With the above Mahābhāṣya (-SBr) passage, contrast the verbal contest between Vepacitti, ruler of the Asuras, and Sakka, sovereign of the devas, in S I 222.20-224.15 (supra n. 11): « the verses spoken by Vepacitti belong to the sphere of force and violence... » (*sa-dandāvacarā sa-satthāvacarā iti bhanḍanam iti viggaho iti kalaho [ti]*, cf. Ne Se); those spoken by Indra, on the contrary, were « free from force and violence... », and this ensured the latter's victory: *a-dandāvacarā a-satthāvacarā... Sak-kassa devānam indassa subhāsita jayo ahsosi* (224.8-14).

For discussions similar to Spk I 272-275 (and the sociolinguistic attitudes or conflicts they reflect), see the lives of the « Marathi saint-poets », in M. M. DESHPANDE, *loc cit.*, 68 ff.

60. Spk I.274-20-23 (Ee att') = Pj II.398.11-12. Such an asseveration clearly is not unlike the Buddha's famous advice « *anujānāmi bhikkhave sakāya niruttiyā buddha-vacanam pariyāpūnūti* » *ti*, permitting the disciples « to learn the Buddha-word each in (his) own language », Vin II.139.14-16. For a summary of the discussions on the interpretation of this phrase, E. LAMOTTE, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien*, p. 610 ff.; recently, J. BROUH, *Sakāya niruttiyā: Cauld kale het*, in « The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition » (*Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung*, II), ed. H. Bechert, Göttingen, 1980 (Abh. der Ak. der Wiss. in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Kl. Dritte Folge, n° 117), 35-42.

61. I may be permitted to quote what Professor E. Lamotte writes to me in connection with the above remarks:

« Dans la généralité des cas, le *subhāsita* est *satya*, mais pas toujours. Il peut se faire que le Buddha, tenant compte des dispositions et de la mentalité de ses auditeurs, leur enseigne une erreur, mais ce n'est qu'un artifice salvifique.

Le Buddha a refusé de se prononcer sur les grands problèmes philosophiques qui préoccupent l'humanité: l'éternité des êtres, la survie, les rapports entre le corps et l'esprit (cf. *Traité*, I, p. 153 sq.), non pas que ce soient des questions insolubles, mais parce que les réponses sont discutables, provoquent des querelles et ne sont d'aucune utilité à la délivrance.

Vu dans ce contexte, le *Subhāsita* est au premier chef une parole aboutissant à la destruction des passions, à la fin de la douleur, à l'apaisement de l'esprit, au *Nirvāna*. Tant mieux si cette bonne parole est strictement vraie, agréable à entendre, énoncée selon toutes les règles de la grammaire, mais ce n'est pas nécessaire. La loi bouddhique n'a qu'une saveur (*rasa*): celle de la *Vimukti*.

A ce propos,... dire un mot de l'enseignement intentionnel ou énigmatique du Buddha (*samdhā-bhāṣya, samdhāya bhāṣita*) où le paradoxe tient un grand rôle... » (16th January, 1983).